

Yesterday morning I was in the Dupont Circle Bldg on the Post Mortem cover. I parked at the Colonial lot on N St. next to the NR bldg. When I finished my business on the cover there was a short time before the third hour of parking charges began so I went into the NR bldg and asked for Mr. Peretz, was told he was in New York, then the mg. ed., and was told he was in conference, and then explained my purpose and asked if anyone who could talk to me was in and free. The receptionist picked up the phone and called a number and said, "You'd better come down."

A young man named "Marshall, I think Everett, did, promptly. I told him I had an ethical question to raise and complaint to make. I then explained my feeling about their and the Star's use of the Szulc story and its deceptiveness and misrepresentations and of my having been in touch with each publication about this material earlier.

I told him the records would show that all compelled declassifications were over my FOIA use and that both publications had failed to report this at any time. That I have been trying to get these withheld sessions released and that I am now in court on all, which also was omitted from the Szulc writing.

That I had written Mr. Peretz making a proposal to him last December - with a copy to Mr. Pincus* and the receptionist interrupted with a curt "he hasn't been here for a month." (Approx., faithful to content.) I said this had been in December - last year - when he was here, and that neither had responded nor, as with the Star, had there even been an acknowledgement.

I said that I did not know and was not claiming this amounts to plagiarism. I did express the belief that it was plain dishonest and went past that when I had written the owner and managing editor, so NR knew and still misrepresented the entire situation and in effect made a claim to my work.

At one point when this was the subject Marshall exclaimed, "I told Szulc it had been used." (Again, faithful, perhaps only approx.)

So this makes it more unethical, I told him, because aside from my letters you were aware of the syndicated stories of which I told him.

He asked practically no questions is a single one. I was and did not hide my anger and said I hoped he would understand that when I have done all this work for all these years without any assistance from NR or any others he could begin to understand my emotion when for all practical purposes they ripped it off. I reminded him that I had had a similar experience under Luce but did not then know Luce was on the CIA payroll. He said something to the effect those days are over.

He didn't offer an apology, ask me to wait for the mg ed or say anyone would be in touch with me. So, I told him I believe NR owes me something over this, that I was not making a demand but did expect something to be proposed. When he said nothing I gave him my name, address and phone number.

I do find it unusual that with this kind of complaint he would not want an executive to speak to me. And that there was no call from anyone yesterday or until this minute, not quite 3 p.m.

That he had no expression of regret or even pro forma apology while admitting that he knew this was not Szulc's original work must have angered me more because I know that while I had not lost my temper and was not angry when I entered I was quite angry when I left. Knowing the work was not original they still presented it as their/Szulc's original work. I remember telling him also that I had about 300 pages of a manuscript of a study written and had filed suits for the remaining transcripts. I do.

Apparently they are making a big thing out of that special issue. I bought two copies. They had boxes of them stacked in the reception room. The receptionist took these two from an open box.

Because of lack of NR interest I was there a short while only. It was after 11 when I left Sammie Abbott's office, my second hour was up 11:27, and I paid for two hours only.

From there I went to Deser's and reported this to him briefly.